

DRAFT

LANCASTER COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE (MPO) MINUTES OF MEETING

DATE: 26 April 2004

PLACE: Christian Street Court, Suite 300

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Commissioner Molly Henderson
Lois Herr
Charles Douts
Nancy Halliwell
Virginia Brady
Scott Ulrich
Allan Granger
Mayor Smithgall
Charlotte Katzenmoyer
George Alspach
Fred Ward
Justin Thomas
Tom Kotay
Walt Panko
Jeff Weaver
Terry Adams
Sandra Thompson
Daniel Zimmerman
David Eberly

Board of County Commissioners
Lancaster County Planning Commission
Lancaster County Planning Commission
Lancaster County Planning Commission
Lancaster County Planning Commission
Lancaster County Planning Commission
Lancaster County Planning Commission
City of Lancaster
City of Lancaster
City of Lancaster
City of Lancaster
City of Lancaster
Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, Central Office
Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, Central Office
Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, District 8
Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, District 8
Red Rose Transit Authority
Transportation Authority
Airport Authority

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Hon. Noah Wenger, Hon. Gibson Armstrong, Janet Kempf, Arlene Schulman, Larry Budney, Julianne Dickson, Barry Hoffman, Lou Schultz, Jonathan Price, Spencer Stevens, Dan Walston

GUESTS:

Bob Thompson
James Lutz
Travis Martin
Tom Smithgall
Bernie Harris
Robert Stoner
Jim Williams

Senator Armstrong's Office
RTA
Lancaster Chamber of Commerce
Transportation Authority
Lancaster New Era
Manheim Borough
East Petersburg Borough

STAFF:

Ronald Bailey
Dave Royer
Lauri Ahlskog
Christie Stephens

Executive Director, LCPC
Senior Transportation Planner
Transportation Planner
Administrative Secretary

ORDER OF BUSINESS:

1. Call to Order: Chairperson Henderson called the meeting to order at 12:30pm.
2. Approval of Minutes of 23 February 2004: Lois Herr made a motion to approve the minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Fred Ward. The motion passed unanimously.
4. Adoption of the Draft Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan Phase II: Lauri Ahlskog presented the final Draft Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan Phase II based on TTAC's recommendation for approval. Ms. Ahlskog noted that a couple of corrections had been made to the Plan after the mailing. Jeff Weaver had several comments related to the plan. Mr. Weaver's primary concern was the document itself did not refer to meeting ADA requirements in regards to pedestrian facilities. Staff agreed to have its consultant address this concern. Mr. Weaver also commented on the US 30 Bridge Rehabilitation Project from York County to Mountville Borough located on page 36. This project was listed in the plan as a project with opportunity to include bicycle and pedestrian facilities during the construction phase. The plan recommends providing enough space for bikes and pedestrians under the bridges. However, bridge rehabilitation does not provide for work under the bridge. Bridge rehabilitation projects usually deal with work being done to the deck and not on the tiers or roadway underneath the bridge. Mr. Weaver asked for the removal of the project from the list on page 36. Staff agreed to remove the project.

In relation to ADA standards, Daniel Zimmerman asked if a breakdown of cost for the Fruitville Pike Bridge aesthetics had ever been done. Mr. Zimmerman also asked if an aesthetics treatment standard had been set for the other bridges entering Lancaster City, such as the Dillerville Road Bridge and the Lititz Pike Bridge. After some discussion on ADA standards, it was determined that the Fruitville Pike Bridge does meet the new ADA standards of 36 inches. Mr. Zimmerman suggested meeting more than ADA minimal requirements when in the planning stage for both the Dillerville Road and Lititz Pike Bridges. George Alspach made a motion to approve the plan as amended. The motion was seconded by Mayor Smithgall. The motion passed unanimously.
5. Confirm Results of Phone Ballot-Dillerville Road Bridge: A phone ballot was conducted with the MPO on 12 March 2004 to move \$2 million into the Right-of-Way and Utility phase of the Dillerville Road Bridge project. Terry Adams said the \$2 million amendment was needed to allow Armstrong World Industries to design and construct their utility relocation in advance of the bridge construction. Of the 22 voting members, we were able to officially reach 17 members. There were 17 votes for approval with 0 votes against the amendment. Dave Royer asked the committee to confirm their votes. Allan Granger made a motion to accept the results of the phone ballot. The motion was seconded by Daniel Zimmerman. The motion passed unanimously.
6. Approval of Financial Plan for the 2005-2030 Long Range Transportation Plan: Dave Royer informed TTAC of the current efforts to update the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The plan currently being updated, along with the Draft 2005-2008 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), will be presented to the MPO in June for adoption. Prior to the adoption, these documents including the Air Quality Conformity Analysis Report will be open to public review and comment for a period of one month. Like the TIP, the LRTP must be financially constrained. Mr. Royer provided a handout to the MPO showing the current draft funding and cost analysis. The analysis reflects the removal of the PA 72 Bypass project. Total LRTP project costs are \$982 million. Total

funds available are \$925 million, leaving a funding shortage of \$57 million. Funds available were based on an anticipated 9% increase from new transportation bill in Washington. More work is needed to bridge this gap, as the funding shortage needs to reflect \$0. One possible solution is to show a cost reduction to the PA 23 project. The funding analysis used the highest cost alternative in figuring the cost of the project. Tom Kotay of PennDOT said by using a lower cost alternative for PA 23, the gap will more than likely be closed.

Lois Herr asked the committee to respond to the letter written by Manheim Borough asking the MPO to include some improvements to PA 72 on the TIP if major improvements cannot be completed. Terry Adams said the PA 72 project is a good project, however it was not as advanced in the EIS process as US 30 and PA 23. Mr. Adams asked the committee to refer to Secretary Biehler's funding philosophies included in the mailing packet. The State's position is to not let the existing system deteriorate at the expense of new facilities. Daniel Zimmerman recommended the corridor receive some improvements to make it more efficient to handle the traffic volumes that it currently has. Mr. Royer said the PA 72 is still identified in the Long Range Plan as an unfunded need, making it eligible to be placed back on the TIP if funding becomes available.

Robert Stoner, Manager of Manheim Borough, spoke on behalf of the Borough in regards to the PA 72 hold status. Mr. Stoner said the Borough finds the removal of the PA 72 project and no improvement options on the TIP unacceptable. Mr. Stoner said PA 72 needs to at least have funding for other improvements if the actual bypass cannot be funded. PA 72 involves both safety issues and congestion issues. Mr. Kotay said line items in the LRTP will support improvements to PA 72 or other routes as the line items are not designated for any particular project.

Mr. Bailey warned the committee not to be swayed by the thinking of low cost alternative solutions for PA 72. Low cost alternatives would have been pursued long ago. Basically, the PA 72 corridor is an old obsolete road and is a major commercial corridor that services the largest known auto auction. After some discussion Mr. Bailey also said the bottom line is there are not enough funds available to Lancaster County to meet the needs. Until the funding situation is addressed, Lancaster County will continue to face these types of issues.

Ms. Herr questioned the committee's priorities with PA 23 versus PA 72 and suggested having some method in place to weigh the needs of both corridors. Someone outside of Lancaster County may view PA 72 as having a greater need for improvements than PA 23. Ms. Herr asked if there was a way to make some improvements to the corridor and give the municipalities involved some assurance that PA 72 is not entirely eliminated from the LRTP and TIP. Mr. Kotay said this is being done in the LRTP through line items that are not identified with a specific project. As the County, MPO, and TTAC move into the future and identify priorities in the PA 72 corridor, these line items can be used for those priorities.

Ms. Herr said in the interest of moving forward the committee should accept the modification. However, she would like it officially documented that the committee discussed the issue of removing PA 72 at length and is concerned with this decision. Ms. Herr made a motion to accept the draft financial plan. The motion was seconded by George Alspach. Mr. Bailey clarified the motion by

saying the committee is being asked to approve the financial document to release it for public review and comment. A motion to adopt the final draft plan will not be asked for until the 28 June 2004 meeting after the plan has undergone public review and all comments are documented. The motion to accept the draft financial plan for the Draft 2005-2030 Long Range Transportation Plan passed unanimously.

3. Amendment to the Transit Portion of the FFY 2003-2006 TIP: This item was postponed pending the arrival of Mr. Lutz. Mr. Lutz said the proposal of this TIP amendment is submitted annually to incorporate the changes in the Authority's Capital Budget with the TIP. The TIP amendment includes the following: security cameras for the buses, replacement of office equipment and furniture, Queen Street enhancements, bike lockers enhancements, farebox replacements, lease/purchase of bus tires, communication equipment upgrades, maintenance equipment upgrades, and bus information signs. The amendment also has an item recommended by the Federal Highway Administration to set aside funds to study the transit options available in the Strasburg Area. Mayor Smithgall made a motion to approve the amendment as presented. The motion was seconded by Daniel Zimmerman. The motion passed unanimously.

7. Draft FFY 2005-2008 TIP-Balancing the Program and Priorities: Walt Panko presented this item. As mentioned before, the Secretary of Transportation has asked for several projects to be stopped and several others to be reevaluated. Two of these projects are located in Lancaster County. The PA 72 project was recommended for removal from the program with PA 23 being recommended for reevaluation. The Draft TIP for Lancaster County reflects these recommendations. Concerns were raised by LCPC staff regarding the timing of the construction phases of the Lancaster City Amtrak Station, Paradise Rail Station, and College Avenue extension projects on the Draft TIP. Based on these concerns, PennDOT agreed to rework the funding of various projects and phases to see if it was possible to keep the construction funds for the City Amtrak Station in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006 as proposed. Mr. Panko presented the MPO with Option 2-Modified, the option TTAC chose at its last meeting on 14 April 2004.

With this option, construction funds for the PA 501 Spot Widening project will be advanced to 2004. The Preliminary Engineering funds for the Park and Ride Lot project will also be advanced to 2004. The Lancaster City Amtrak Station will receive CMAQ funds for construction in the amount of \$2.373 million in 2005, \$1.114 million in 2006, and \$1.770 million in 2007. Non-CMAQ funds will be provided to the station project in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006. Also, CMAQ funds for the Chamber's Rideshare Promo/Planning project will be delayed one year from FFY 2006 to FFY 2007. Some funding for intersection improvements at PA 23 and Groffdale Road will be delayed one year from FFY 2006 to FFY 2007. A CMAQ Reserve Line Item in the amount of \$1.3 million in 2007.

Mr. Zimmerman expressed his concern that advancing the funding for PA 501 Spot Widening Project in FFY 2004 would delay the project. Mr. Kotay explained by obligating the construction funds for the PA 501 Spot Widening project in FFY 2004, a delay in the project will not be caused. Obligating the funds in 2004 will make those funds available to the project, while at the same time, freeing up the capacity to allow the Amtrak Station funding in FFY 2005.

Addressing concerns over the Rideshare Promo/Planning project, Mr. Panko said he has been in contact with Travis Martin of the Lancaster Chamber of Commerce and Industry regarding the

project. Mr. Panko indicated if the project began to progress, CMAQ funding might be made available from another project.

Charles Douts made a motion to approve Option 2-Modified as recommended by TTAC. The motion was seconded by Daniel Zimmerman. The motion passed unanimously. Mr. Bailey had one final note to add on the TIP discussion before moving on to the next agenda item. He said a phone ballot will most likely be conducted with the MPO in regards to a FFY 2004 TIP Amendment to add a CMAQ eligible project. The amendment will allow for major facilities relocation for Norfolk Southern in the Dillerville Yard with the use of CMAQ funding. The project has passed air-quality conformity analysis. The phone ballot is expected to take place before the next MPO meeting of 28 June 2004.

8. Projects for the Draft FFY 2005-2008 TIP and Draft 2005-2030 LRTP for Air Quality Conformity Analysis: David Royer said a listing of 56 projects for Air Quality Conformity Analysis was included in the meeting information mailing. TTAC approved this listing of projects at their 14 April 2004 meeting. Carol Palmoski is currently using this listing to perform the analysis. A majority of the projects are air quality beneficial, with the two exceptions being US 30 East project and PA 23. Mr. Royer said, for the next TIP and LRTP update, the project listing will indicate whether the project is air quality beneficial or not and what year(s) the project falls in.

9. Transportation Action Plan: Mr. Adams said the changes on the action plan are in bold. Mayor Smithgall asked if the Buck Intersection project takes into consideration the plans for the new shopping center. Mayor Smithgall is concerned the intersection being built will be obsolete with the additional 20,000 plus vehicles entering the intersection as a result of the planned shopping center. Jeff Weaver of PennDOT said the Buck Intersection project must proceed both for environmental and safety reasons. However, the shopping center is not moving at the same progression rate as the intersection project. Therefore, the shopping center or PennDOT may have to make adjustments to the intersection after the center is constructed.

10. Other Business & Public Participation: Mr. Panko asked the committee to find at their seats the FFY 2003-2006 TIP modifications. This is provided to the committee for its information.

11. Next Scheduled Meeting: **28 June 2004 at 12:30p.m.**

12. Adjournment: With no further business to come before the committee, the meeting was adjourned at 2:05 p.m.